UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/613,123	07/10/2000	William N. Schilit	FXPL-01022US0	8793

23910 7590 11/28/2007

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 CALIFORNIA STREET
14TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94108

EXAMINER	
HALIM, SAHERA	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2157	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/28/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/613,123	SCHILIT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sahera Halim	2157	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *07 September 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-8 and 10-14* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-8 and 10-14* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *9/4/07*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is responsive to Amendment filled September 7, 2007.

2. Claims 1-8 and 10-14 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claim 1 recites "non-hyperlink web content data item". The examiner fails to find support for this limitation in the specification. The specification of current application on page 2 states, "The document is referred to as a "Web page," and the information contained in the Web page is called content. Web pages often refer to other Web pages using "hypertext links", also referred to as "hyper-links", or simply as "links". The links are typically associated with words, phrases, or images representing the other pages in a form that gives the browser the URL for the corresponding Web page when the user selects a link." The specification does not make it clear that the Web pages are parsed to identify non-hyperlink web content. According to the specification the links could be associated with a

phrase, which could be an address, email address, phone number etc. Since the examiner does not find support for this limitation in the specification, there is no weight given to this limitation in writing this rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1, 2, and 12 –14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin, Jr. et al., U.S. Pat. No. 6,610,105 (hereinafter Martin) in view of US. Pat. No. 6,334,145 to Adams et al. (hereinafter Adams).

7. Regarding claim 1, Martin discloses a method as claimed, for proving data detection from Web content information for a mobile device comprising the steps of: (col. 2, line 34 – col. 3, line 51):

receiving a URL from a user (col. 2, line 47 – 49, the server receives a request from a mobile device to access a portal, which is done though a URL request);

accessing a Web page identified by the URL (col. 8, line 1 – 6, the portal is accessed by the URL);

displaying to the mobile device one or more link indications that correspond to the one or more Web content data items time (See Fig. 3B and col. 9, lines 7 – 37; the portal provides a number of links on the mobile device), each link indication providing a link to a service through a wireless connection from the mobile device, and each service performing a service related to a type of Web content data item, for the Web content data item corresponding to the link indication (col. 9, line 18 – 37, the links and data corresponding to the link is displayed on the mobile device)

Although the system discloses by Martin teaches substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose parsing the currently accessed Web page dynamically in real time to identify one or more non-hyperlink Web content data items in the Web page. Nonetheless these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Martin, as evidenced by Adams. Adams disclose parsing the currently accessed Web page dynamically in real time to identify one or more Web content data items in the Web page (See Fig. 12 and col. 12, line 38 – 56; the method scans the displayed home page for all provided links or URL addresses). Given the teachings of Martin and Adams, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Martin by parsing the web page for links such as disclosed by Adams, in order to decrease visual complexity (col. 6, line 8 – 20).

8. Regarding claim 2, Martin discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising the steps of providing a user keypad on the mobile device to enable the user to select one of the one or more link indication to be activated; and activating one of the one or more link indications when the user selects the particular one of the one or more link indications (col. 5, lines 52 - 63).

9. Regarding claim 12, Martin discloses wherein the mobile device can be one of:

an Internet phone (col. 5, line 18 - 25);

a personal digital assistant (col. 5, line 18 - 25); and

a two way pager ((col. 5, line 18 - 25).

10. Reference to claims13 and 14, Martin teaches wherein parsing the currently accessed Web page occurs in a network server and within a Web browser (col. 3, line 22-37 and col. 9, line 18-37 and col. 12, line 17 – col. 13, line 14).

Claims 3 –5 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin in view Adams and further in view of De Boor et al., U.S. Pat. No. 6,675,204 (hereinafter Boor).

11. Regarding claim 3, Martin and Adams fail to disclose wherein one of the one or more Web content data items comprises a telephone number. However, Boor teaches the web content data comprises a telephone number (col. 13, lines 28 – line 58). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Martin and Adams by Boor in order to enhance the system functionality.

12. Reference to claim 4, Martin and Adams fail to disclose wherein one of the one or more Web content data item is a telephone number. However, Boor teaches the web content data is a telephone number (col. 13, lines 28 – line 58). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Martin and Adams by Boor in order to enhance the system functionality. Moreover, Martin, Adams and Boor fail to teach the link indication is activated by dialing the number. However, this feature is well known and would have been an obvious modification for person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to in order to reduce the steps of dialing a number.

13. Regarding claim 5, Martin and Adam fail teach wherein one of the one or more web content data item is an address number. However, Boor discloses the web content data is an address number (col. 13, lines 28 – line 58). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify Martin and Adam by Boor in order to enhance the system functionality.

14. Regarding claim 7, Martin and Adams fail to disclose wherein one of the one or more Web content data item is an e-mail address. However, Boor discloses the Web content data is an e-mail address (col. 13, lines 28 – line 58). It would have been to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the above limitation into the system of Martin and Adams to increase system functionality.

15. Claims 10 and 6, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin in view of Adams and further in view of Buckham et al., U.S. Pat No. 6,662,016 (hereinafter Buckham).

16. Regarding claim 10, Martin teaches a method :

receiving a URL from a user (col. 2, line 47 – 49, the server receives a request from a mobile device to access a portal, which is done though a URL request);

accessing a Web page data file identified by the URL (col. 8, line 1 – 6, the portal is accessed by the URL);

providing a user keypad on the mobile device to enable the user to select the link indication (col. 5, lines 52 - 63).

Although Martin discloses substantial features of the claimed invention (explained above), he fails to disclose parsing the currently accessed Web page dynamically in real time to identify one or more Web content data items in the Web page. Nonetheless these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Martin, as evidenced by Adams. Adams disclose parsing the currently accessed Web page dynamically in real time to identify one or more Web content data items in the Web page (See Fig. 12 and col. 12, line 38 – 56; the method scans the displayed home page for all provided links or URL addresses). Given the teachings of Martin and Adams, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Martin by parsing the web page for links such as disclosed by Adams, in order to decrease visual complexity (col. 6, line 8 – 20).

Moreover, Martin and Adam fail to teach if one of the one or more web content data items comprises a street address, then displaying to the mobile device a link indication that corresponds to the street address, the link indication providing a link to an online map service through a wireless connection from the mobile device ; and displaying to the mobile device by the online map service the location of the street address on an online map if the user selects the link indication to activate the link the web content data item is an address and providing a user keypad selection of the mobile device enabling a map to be provided showing a location for the identified address. However, in an analogous art, Buckham teaches displaying the address on a display of the mobile device and a map to be provided showing a location for the identified address (Fig. 1,

numeral 147, Fig. 2, numeral 202, 204 and Fig. 4 and col. 2, lines 24 – col. 4, lines 8). Having the teachings of Martin, Adam and Buckham, it would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the above limitation into Martin and Adam in order to increase utilizations of the system.

17. Claims 11 and 8, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin in view of Adam and further in view of Backham.

18. Regarding claim 11, Martin discloses receiving a URL from a user (col. 2, line 47 – 49, the server receives a request from a mobile device to access a portal, which is done though a URL request);
accessing a Web page data file identified by the URL (col. 8, line 1 – 6, the portal is accessed by the URL);

providing a user keypad on the mobile device to enable the user to select the link indication (col. 5, lines 52 - 63).

Although Martin discloses substantial features of the claimed invention (explained above), he fails to disclose parsing the currently accessed Web page dynamically in real time to identify one or more Web content data items in the Web page. Nonetheless these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Martin, as evidenced by Adams. Adams disclose parsing the currently accessed Web page dynamically in real time to identify one or more Web content data items in the Web page (See

Fig. 12 and col. 12, line 38 – 56; the method scans the displayed home page for all provided links or URL addresses). Given the teachings of Martin and Adams, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Martin by parsing the web page for links such as disclosed by Adams, in order to decrease visual complexity (col. 6, line 8 – 20).

Moreover, Martin and Adam fail to teach if one of the one or more web content data items comprises an e-mail address, then displaying to the mobile device a link indication that corresponds to the email address, the link indication providing a link to an email service through a wireless connection from the mobile device;

and initiating an email to the email address by mobile device using the email service if the user selects the link indication to activate the link.

However, Buckham teaches displaying the address on a display of the mobile device and an e-mail initiation (co. 9, line 7 – 12 and Fig. 1, numeral 147, Fig. 2, numeral 202, 204). It would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Martin and Adam by Buckham order to enhance user stratification by providing more functionality to the system.

19. Claims 6 and 8 have similar limitations as to claims 10 and 11; therefore, they are rejected under the same rational.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed September 7, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant argues that Adam fails to teach non-

hyperlink content. The examiner failed to find support for this limitation in the specification. Therefore, no weight has been give for this limitation. Moreover, the applicant argues that Martin does not discuss what these services might be. The applicant correctly recognized that in Martin when a link is clicked the user taken to a content. Providing a content is a service. The applicant also argues that Martin creates different user interfaces. The claims do not require single interface. This limitation is not found in the claims.

Conclusion

20. The applicant argues in reference to claim 1, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sahera Halim whose telephone number is (571) 272-4003. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday and Thursdays 7:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Sahera Halim
Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2157

November 20, 2007

ARIO ETIENNE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100